

AN ANALYSIS OF CLASSROOM INTERACTION AT THE SECOND YEAR OF SMP 17 GEDONGTATAAN

By

Inggar Ginarsih, Muhammad Sukirlan, Deddy Supriyadi
Lampung University
Inggar90@yahoo.com

Abstract: The objectives of this research are (1) to investigate the process of classroom interaction in teaching and learning process, (2) to find out the pattern of classroom interaction suggested by Sinclair and Coulthard Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) model in English speaking class at SMP 17 GedongTataan. The result reveals that classroom interaction process in English speaking class reflected the pattern proposed by Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) Model. There are six exchanges there are which occurred in Sinclair and Coulthard model including *Teacher Inform*, *Teacher Direct*, *Teacher Elicit*, *Student Elicit*, *Student Inform*, and *Check*. The percentage of *Student Inform* (Initiation-Feedback/IF) was 33.97%, *Teacher Elicit* (Initiation-Response-Feedback/IRF) was 16.89%, *Student Elicit* (Initiation-Response/IR) was 14.95%, *Teacher Inform* (Initiation/I) was 14.12%, *Check* (Initiation-Response-Feedback/IRF) was 13.01%, and *Teacher Direct* (Initiation-respond-feedback/IRF) was 7.20%.

Key words: *Teacher Inform*, *Teacher Direct*, *Teacher Elicit*, *Student Elicit*, *Student Inform*, and *Check*.

ANALISA INTERAKSI DALAM KELAS PADA KELAS 2 SMP 17 GEDONGTATAAN

Oleh

Inggar Ginarsih, Muhammad Sukirlan, Deddy Supriyadi
Universitas Lampung
Inggar90@yahoo.com

Abstrak: Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah (1) untuk menyelidiki proses interaksi belajar mengajar di kelas, (2) untuk mengetahui pola interaksi kelas yang disarankan oleh Sinclair dan Coulthard dengan pola Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) dalam berbahasa Inggris. Data dikumpulkan dari interaksi antara guru dan siswa ketika mereka berada di kelas. Interaksi yang terjadi di kelas dicatat dengan menggunakan video rekaman.

Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa proses interaksi di kelas berbahasa Inggris mencerminkan pola yang diusulkan oleh pola Initiation-Response-Feedback(IRF). Ada enam pola yang terjadi di pola Sinclair dan Coulthard yang diantaranya *Guru Memberitahu*, *Guru Memerintah*, *Guru Bertanya*, *Murid Bertanya*, *Murid Memberitahu*, dan *Memeriksa*. Persentase *Murid Memberitahu* adalah 33,97%, *Guru Bertanya* adalah 16,89%, *Murid Bertanya* (adalah 14,95%, *Guru Memberitahu* adalah 14,12%, *Memeriksa* adalah 13,01%, dan *Guru Memerintah* adalah 7,20%.

Kata kunci: *Guru Memberitahu, Guru Memerintah, Guru Bertanya, Murid Bertanya, Murid Memberitahu, dan Memeriksa*

Introduction

Generally, there are four skills of English which should be taught in Junior High School in Indonesia namely, listening, speaking, reading, and writing. But in teaching learning English, speaking skill is put ahead than the other skills. According to Tarigan (1982:5) speaking is the ability to communicate with language and the primary aim of speaking is for communication.

Speaking is very important and it seems that it is more demanding in the language teaching and learning. Speaking has closed relationship with the communication and interaction because one of the functions of the language is for communication. However, it is indicated that students are not able to express their idea because they do not speak fluently and they are not able pronounce the word clearly. This problem may be caused by the fact that the students and the teacher do not interact frequently and effectively in the classroom.

Classroom interaction is the action performed by the teacher and the students in the process of teaching and learning in the classroom. Classroom interaction covers classroom behaviors such as turn-taking, questioning and answering, negotiation of meaning, and feedback (Chaudron, 1998:10). In addition, according to Brown (2001), interaction is at the heart of communicative competence. When a learner interact with another learner he/she receives input and produce output.

Based on the researcher's pre-observation when conducting pre-teaching service (PPL) in SMP 17 GedongTataan, it was found out that the students have problems in

speaking. For example, there are several students who are not able to express their idea in English both in written and oral form. Secondly, it seemed that the students did not have substantial amount of vocabulary mastery and thirdly the students often give few respond when the teacher ask the question in the classroom. These problems may be caused by the quality of interaction between the teacher and the students, and the students and the teacher.

Initiation-responds-feedback (IRF) model is a model of classroom interaction which provides guidance for analyzing spoken language, which was developed from classroom interaction (McCarthy, 2002:36). Thus, the researcher uses Sinclair and Coulthard Initiation-responds-feedback (IRF) model as guidance for analyzing teacher and student interaction.

Moreover, I wanted prove that the principles of communicative language teaching suggested by Larsen-Freeman (1986:128-130) they are (1) The target language is vehicle for classroom communication, not just the object of study, (2) Games are important because they have in common with real communication events, (3) Students should be given an opportunity to express their ideas and opinions, (4) One of teacher's major responsibilities is to establish situations likely to promote communications, (5) The teacher acts as an advisor during communicative activities, (6) Students should be given opportunities to develop strategies for interpreting language as it is actually used by native speaking could make the students more active than the teacher in the classroom interaction.

Based on the background of the problem stated above, this research is conducted to analyze the classroom interaction because it involves the student to interact with both of teacher and student. In the teacher's question it can provoke the students and the teacher answer or respond the students. Thus, the researcher entitles this research: "An Analysis of Classroom Interaction at the Second Year of SMP 17 Gedong Tataan"

Based on the background stated previously, the writer formulated the problems as follows:

1. How is the process of classroom interaction in English speaking class at the second year of SMP 17 Gedong Tataan?
2. How is the pattern of classroom interaction suggested by Sinclair and Coulthard Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) model in English speaking class at the second year of SMP 17 Gedong Tataan?

Methodology

The researcher carried out a qualitative research because the researcher was interested in observing the description of people, event, opinions, attitude, and environment, or even the combinations of the interaction of these aspects that can be observed. In this case, the researcher focused on the process teaching and learning. The research was conducted in SMP 17 GedongTataan the sample of research was the VIIIA junior high school first semester. This class was chosen randomly by using lottery. The data were collected from the interaction between teacher and students when they were in speaking class. The interactions that occurred in the class were recorded by using

video recorder. After recording, the data were analyzed based on the category using Sinclair and Coulthard model.

The researcher, as the teacher, recorded during the process of teaching English in the classroom. Furthermore, the data were focused on the teaching learning process by analyzing the interactional conversation among teacher-students and students-teacher in speaking class by using Sinclair and Coulthard Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) model. To describe the data, the researcher used descriptive method.

Result and Discussion

In general, the activities done by the teacher and the students were mostly similar. The pre teaching was started by opening the class, after that she greeted the students and checked their presence, and then the teacher gave some brainstorming. Meanwhile, the main activities were dominated by the students' dialogue presentations in front of the class followed by checking the pronunciation and evaluation from the teacher. In the post activities, the teacher finished checking students', then she asked the students to continue their homework, and finally the teacher closed the meeting. Table 1 below included the quantities and percentage of the teaching exchange pattern.


Table 1**Quantities and Percentage in Teaching Exchange Patterns**

Teaching Exchange Patterns	Predicted Moves	First Meeting		Second Meeting		Average Data	
		Quantity	%	Quantity	%	Quantity	%
Teacher Information	Initiation (I)	11	6.01 %	40	22.47 %	51	14.12 %
Teacher Direction	Initiation Response Feedback (IRF)	8	4.37 %	18	10.11 %	26	7.20 %
Teacher Elicitation	Initiation Response Feedback (IRF)	29	15.85 %	32	17.97 %	61	16.89 %
Student Elicitation	Initiation-Response (IR)	27	14.75 %	27	15.16 %	54	14.95 %
Student Information	Initiation Feedback (IF)	83	45.35 %	39	21.91 %	122	33.79 %
Check	Initiation Response Feedback (IRF)	25	13.66 %	22	12.35 %	47	13.01 %
Total		183	100%	178	100%	361	100%

Based on the table, the first and second meeting, it can be seen that the students talk occurs more frequently in the first meeting than in the second meeting. It might be caused by the fact in the first meeting, the teacher asked the students to describe and guess the object. Whether in the second meeting, the teacher gave much explaining the material expression of asking, accepting, and refusing for help then the teacher asked the students to make short conversation of expression of asking and refusing for help. The average percentage of teaching exchange pattern from the first and the second observation is presented by the following graph.

Figure 1

Percentage of Teaching Exchange Pattern



Based on the result before, it can be inferred that students are more active than teacher because the teacher acts as an advisor during communication activities. Besides that students were active in interaction in the class because teacher gave the kind of game and opportunities performed their dialogue in front of class. This activities seem to be relevant the principles of communicative language teaching. Furthermore in the background of the problem that the following principles are tips worth considering in communicative teaching suggested by Larsen-Freeman (1986:128-130) such as (1) The target language is vehicle for classroom communication, not just the object of study, (2) Games are important because they have in common with real communication events, (3) Students should be given an opportunity to express their ideas and opinions, (4) One of teacher's major responsibilities is to establish situations likely to promote communications, (5) The teacher acts as an advisor during communicative activities, (6) Students should be

given opportunities to develop strategies for interpreting language as it is actually used by native speaking were proved that the students more active than the teacher in the classroom interaction.

Conclusion

Concerning with the discussion of the research finding, the researcher comes to some conclusion as follows:

The process of classroom interaction in English speaking class reflects the classroom interaction pattern suggested by Sinclair and Coulthard Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) model. The model consists of six teaching exchange patterns, namely: *Student Elicit*, *Student Inform*, *Check*, *Teacher Direct*, *Teacher Elicit* and *Teacher Inform*.

The high percentages of *Student Inform* (33.79%) and *Teacher Elicit* (16.89%) indicate that students have their own awareness to get involved in the activity and to participate as well as to interact actively during the teaching learning process. And also teacher participated to get students' respond in the class. The percentage of *Students Elicit* (14.95%) allows the students did not doubt to ask something. The low percentages of *Teacher Inform* (14.12%), *Check* (13.01%), and *Teacher Direct* (7.20%) show that the teacher has managed the whole process of teaching learning well based on what has been prepared on the lesson plan as she plays the role as an initiator and a facilitator for her students.

Suggestions:

Dealing with the conclusions, the researcher would like to propose the following suggestions:

English teachers should accept in mind that interaction is something people can do together i.e. collectively. Obviously, in the classroom it is considered as important for the teacher to manage who should talk, to whom, on what topic, in what language and so on.

English teacher should brainstorm the students who are not really active in the class. For future researchers in the area of classroom interaction, the teacher should needs more strategies in the process of teaching and learning. The class will be alive if the students, including the teacher are fully involved during the activity. The teacher should facilitate the students in their work. The teacher prepares some materials, explains the procedures about what will be discussed and then asks the students whether they have understood the material or not. When the students have problem in their learning, the teacher along with the students helps each other to solve the problem.

References

- Brown. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Analysis Approach to Language Pedagogic*. Second Edition. Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Choudron, C. 1998. *Second Language Classroom – Research on Teaching and Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, M. 2002. *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. New York: Cambridge. University Press.
- Larsen – Freeman. 1986. *Technique and Principles in language Teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tarigan. 1992. *Speaking Skill*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.